

Duval County Public Schools

R. V. Daniels Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

R. V. Daniels Elementary School

1951 W 15TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org/rvdaniels>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To implement gifted strategies to provide creative, analytical, and verbal learning experiences for students to explore their unique talents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every R.V.Daniels student will be inspired to unlock their unique potential in pursuit of life-long learning.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bryant, Johnny	Principal	
Weertz, Andrea	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder involvement and SIP Development input is based on their suggestions and feedback from previous school year's stakeholders meetings for school improvement in the areas of academics and school climate.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP Monitoring will be regularly monitored by administration on a quarterly bases when looking at student assessments and grades each quarter.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	8	9	11	11	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	7	5	9	11	0	0	0	39

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	7	11	14	10	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	9	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	5	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	18	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	10	20	10	7	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	7	11	14	10	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	9	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	5	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	18	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	10	20	10	7	0	0	0	54

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	48	53	53	50	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				61			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			7		
Math Achievement*	54	58	59	53	48	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				47			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			6		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	49	52	54	41	59	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	211
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	9	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	46			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	38	Yes	2	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	42			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	38	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	50			54			49					
SWD	6			11							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	89			95			90				3	
BLK	44			47			36				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40			30			32				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	53	61	54	53	47	38	41					
SWD	17	38		17	15							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	89	83		100	89		92					
BLK	45	55	50	42	37	39	26					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	54	55	28	31	40	22					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	49	32	7	56	35	6	40					
SWD	8			17								
ELL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	93	71		100	64		80					
BLK	41	21	0	45	24	7	24					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	14	0	38	18	9	19					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	50%	5%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	46%	9%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	51%	-1%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

5th Grade Science proficiency performance was at 50%. This was actually a 9 point increase from last year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

No decline from last year's proficiency data, but reading proficiency overall remained the same. Factors that could have contributed to this: implementation of new state benchmarks, new ELA curriculum, new state assessment

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We did not have any huge gaps compared to the state average. But we did notice that our reading achievement data was stagnated as compared to the 2022 and 2023 school year at 53%. Last year with transitioning to new reading benchmarks and new language arts curriculum in grades 3 through 5 we are looking to improve at least three to five percentage points in reading proficiency.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science achievement data showed the most improvement by 9 points. Actions taken by the school to improve in this area were providing professional development for teacher bi-weekly, district curriculum support quarterly, following the science pacing guide.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The number of students who were absent 10% or more days.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Improving of reading proficiency
 Improving of math proficiency
 Improving of Science proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2023-24 school year, a main area of focus will be to teacher lead small group instruction and student learning are aligned to the BEST standards. This will help in specifically increasing the performance of our students who fall into the subgroups of students with disabilities and free/reduce lunch. Having this focus on small group instruction will continue in helping our reading and math goals for this year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Progress monitoring assessments at least every other week to track growth towards proficiency and reorganize small groups.

- Focus student groups: Students approaching proficiency/students needing to maintain proficiency based on 22-23 data
- Intervention groups determined by FAST PM/DMA data
- Progress monitoring assessments at least every other week to track growth towards proficiency

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly teacher guided data chats with students based on FAST PM, DMA, Unit Assessment data, small group progress monitoring data. This area will be monitored also by observation tools used by administrators to make sure lessons are aligned to the benchmarks and to provide follow up with teachers individually and discuss best practices that align. Also the monitoring of student assessment by using student data tracking sheets. The goal is to have students as well track their assessment data and meet with their teacher and administrator to discuss progress or lack thereof and provide next steps. Based on previous year use, students found this tool and meeting effective in helping them achieve their academic goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

During our PLC's, common planning, and early dismissal PD's we want to look at the instructional practices and how teachers are utilizing them during instruction daily. Identify benchmarks covered and assessed throughout the year in our PLCs and making adjustments in our instructional practices that will also prove to be beneficial for our student in our lowest performing subgroups. We plan to achieve this by the following:

Whole group classroom explicit instruction

Small group teacher led instruction with reorganized groups based on data

One-on-One instruction (intervention)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to be intentional on how students are engaging with the benchmarks and instructional materials that are on grade level and with that we need to make sure that our instructional practices are aligned with the appropriate grade level benchmarks that our lowest performing students struggle with during small group instruction. Due to the goal of increasing our proficiency percentages we want to be intentional on

how we monitor instruction and fill in the learning gaps for our students who continue to struggle in reading and math on grade level.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly classroom walk through observations

PLC collaborative session bi-weekly

Title I funds will be utilized to fund another classroom teacher to further promote student achievement.

Title I funds will be utilized to fund a Paraprofessional to help support students and teachers during instructional lessons that will further promote student achievement.

Title I funds will be utilized to purchase learning resources to promote a layer of support for student achievement of our lowest performing students.

Person Responsible: Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We want to focus on teacher retention and recruitment. Over the last two years R.V. Daniels has had a constant turnover in regards to teachers. Most due to teachers either leaving the education field for personal reasons and relocating outside the district. The current issue we face is teacher recruitment and trying to fill vacancies in a timely manner.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monthly feedback forms/surveys from teachers to provide insight on what professional development and morale needs that can be addressed to provide more support in those identified areas. Quarterly one on one meetings between teachers and administration to discuss specific needs with next steps on how administration can further support teachers in the areas of professional development and teacher morale.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During a common planning session once a month there will be a time designated for teachers to participate in a forms survey and then during individual quarterly teacher meetings discuss any areas of grows or glows.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Leadership will engage in grade level and subject area planning and professional development sessions. Review 5 Essentials Survey data

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leadership and teachers will be able to fully engage in conversations in the areas that may potentially affect teacher retention and recruitment in helping to continue to build the culture and climate of the school when it comes to faculty and staff morale.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During first PLC discussing this area of the 5 Essential Survey and getting feedback from teachers on how this are can improve going forward and maintain a level of consistency of practice as well. During the

school year teacher surveys after PLCs, common planning, and early dismissal PDs that pertains to how leadership will help support teacher instructional needs.

Person Responsible: Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2023-24 school year, another focus will be to improve ELA Proficiency to 56% or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will measure this outcome quarterly through FAST PM, DMA, unit assessment data, and small group progress monitoring data.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will track growth towards proficiency through progress monitoring through small group instruction, to specifically monitor growth in reading deficient areas for students. Progress monitoring assessments at least every other week to track growth towards proficiency. Continue to organize intervention groups determined by FAST PM/DMA data. Teachers will attend monthly professional development from DCPS ELA/Literacy department.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

During our PLC's, common planning, and early dismissal PD's we want to look at the instructional practices and how teachers are utilizing them during instruction daily. During these meetings throughout the year our instructional focus will include the following:

- Common Board Configuration
- Small Group Centers
- Tier I supports
- Student engagement
- Progress Monitoring
- Student Assessment Data Chats
- Student Work display

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to be intentional on how teachers are being strategic in focusing on instructional practices that are intentional and streamlined in increasing student proficiency in ELA school wide.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly classroom walk through observations

Utilize curriculum learning resources to provide another layer of support for student achievement the area of ELA

Person Responsible: Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase 5th grade Science proficiency to 50% or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Weekly Science Centers will be implemented. Centers will include teacher-led small group instruction with remediation lessons based on data from previous benchmark assessments. Small group instruction will also collect another set of data points from exit tickets for students to show growth from previous assessments on the same benchmark.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teacher will receive weekly support from region specialist. Support will include lesson planning, modeling of Science lessons, creating and implementing pacing calendars, and content building. Students will also be involved in the process for tracking their data throughout the year, and the teacher will host individual data chats after each set of data to help students set new goals and identify areas of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teacher will attend Monthly Science Meetings with Science Dept to increase content knowledge and understanding of instructional strategies. Teacher will also learn how to triangulate Science data to create and plan for small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly classroom walk through observations
Utilize curriculum learning resources to provide another layer of support for student achievement the area of 5th Grade Science

Person Responsible: Andrea Weertz (weertza@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region)). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
2. Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
3. The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
4. Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
5. Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on 2022-23 data ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an area of focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Based on 2022-23 data ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an area of focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

K-2 Data:

Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring at grade level or above y 3-4 percentage points. decrease number of below grade level students by 3-4 percentage points

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3-5 Data:

Increase percentage of 3-5 grade students scoring level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized English

Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of below grade level students by 3-4 percentage points

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our school leadership team, region 1 support specialists, will review ELA data from district assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bryant, Johnny, bryantj1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Data driven lesson planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small group/differentiated instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered.

Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity.

Checking effectiveness from student data.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is,

either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-studentprogressmonitoringimproves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine nextsteps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Bryant, Johnny,
bryantj1@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The dissemination of this SIP and SWP will be conducted through parent whole group meetings (Title I Parent Developmental and Compact meetings; SAC/PTA meeting)
www.duvalschools.org/rvdaniels

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.
(ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to build positive relationships with families through PTA family engagement events at least once a quarter.
www.duvalschools.org/rvdaniels

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

RVD plans on strengthening the academic program through small student pull out groups and blended learning platforms that can also be practiced at home.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We will utilize Full Service Schools Program that provides specialized support services for students and their families who are dealing with family or personal crisis situations.

Faculty and Staff have access to Head Space Service. This is a free mental health program for employees to provide another layer of support in regard to maintaining a positive mental health for staff members throughout the year.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

This year we will continue to incorporate our Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) schoolwide to promote healthy and positive behaviors for all students to recognize and reward positive behaviors.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes